

1907 PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 28, 1907.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1905-06.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

Professor William L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Chancellor Frank Strong, University of Kansas.
President Herbert Welch, Ohio Wesleyan University.
President H. D. Wild, Williams College.

1906-07.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
 Director C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.
 Professor C. E. St. John, Oberlin College.
 Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College.

1907-08.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A., Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

SECRETARY.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

TREASURER.

Professor W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia, Charlestown, Va.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

First District, Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
 Second District, Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University.
 Third District, Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
 Fourth District, Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
 Fifth District, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
 Sixth District, Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

 ROLL OF MEMBERS.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., William H. Crawford, D. D., President.
 Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., George Harris, LL. D., President.
 Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., John H. Harris, LL. D., President.
 Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, Charles S. Howe, Ph. D., President.
 Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., George E. Merrill, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., William J. Tucker, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Rev. Emory W. Hunt, D. D., President.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., George E. Reed, S. T. D., LL. D., President.
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Rev. J. S. Stahr, LL. D., D. D., President.
 George Washington University, Washington, D. C., Charles W. Needham, LL. D., President.

- Grove City College, Grove City, Pa., Rev. I. C. Ketler, Ph. D., D. D., President.
- Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., M. W. Stryker, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., Isaac Sharpless, Sc. D., LL. D., President.
- Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, Rev. W. F. Pierce, L. H. D., President.
- Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Henry S. Drinker, LL. D., President.
- Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Rev. Guy P. Benton, D. D., LL. D., President.
- New York University, New York City, H. M. MacCracken, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N. Y., Very Rev. Joseph P. Conroy, C. M., President.
- Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Henry C. King, D. D., President.
- Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, W. O. Thompson, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Rev. Herbert Welch, D. D., President.
- Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Charles M. Pratt, A. M., President.
- Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., Rev. W. H. S. Demarest, D. D., President.
- Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J., Rev. James F. Moorey, D. D., President.
- Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Joseph Swain, M. S., LL. D., President.
- Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Rev. J. R. Day, S. T. D., LL. D., President.
- Tufts College, Medford, Mass., F. W. Hamilton, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., Rev. G. Alexander, D. D., President.
- United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Col. H. L. Scott, U. S. A., Superintendent.
- University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Harry P. Judson, LL. D., President.
- University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., James H. Baker, M. A., LL. D., President.
- University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Cyrus Northup, LL. D., President.
- University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Richard Henry Jesse, LL. D., President.
- University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., E. Benjamin Andrews, LL. D., President.
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Francis P. Venable, Ph. D., President.
- University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Charles C. Harrison, LL. D., President.
- University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Rush Rhees, D. D., LL. D., President.
- University of Texas, Austin, Texas, D. F. Houston, LL. D., President.
- University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., M. H. Buckman, D. D., President.
- University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., E. A. Alderman, D. C. L., LL. D., President.
- University of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, Rev. Louis E. Holden, D. D., President.
- Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, LL. D., D. C. L., President.

Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., Rev. J. D. Moffat, D. D., President.
 Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., B. P. Raymond, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Western University of—Pennsylvania, Pittsburg, Pa., S. B. McCormick, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Westminster College, North Wilmington, Pa., Robert M. Russell, D. D., LL. D., President.
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., D. B. Purinton, Ph. D., LL. D., President.
 Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Henry Hopkins, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, Charles G. Heckert, D. D., President.

PROCEEDINGS.

The second annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States met pursuant to the call of the Executive Committee at the Murray Hill Hotel, Saturday, December 28, 1907, at 10 a. m.

President Palmer E. Pierce was in the chair.

The roll was called and the following were recorded in attendance:

1. Accredited delegates representing institutions duly enrolled as members of the Association:

Dr. James A. Babbitt, Haverford, Haverford, Pa.
 Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Professor W. W. Campbell, Westminster, North Wilmington, Pa.
 Rev. John H. Carman, Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N. Y.
 Professor H. G. Chase, Tufts, Medford, Mass.
 Professor A. W. Chez, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Dr. H. H. Cloudman, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
 Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
 Professor Clark W. Hetherington, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Professor George A. Hoadly, Swarthmore, Swarthmore, Pa.
 Professor Charles E. Houghton, New York University, New York City.
 Captain H. J. Koehler, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
 Professor W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
 Professor W. W. Landis, Dickinson, Carlisle, Pa.
 Professor Craven Laycock, Dartmouth, Hanover, N. H.
 Professor James T. Lees, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Professor Charles J. Ling, Allegheny, Meadville, Pa.
 Professor Edwin Lintcn, Washington & Jefferson, Washington, Pa.
 Professor W. E. Metzenthin, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
 Professor Daniel C. Munro, Kenyon, Gambier, Ohio.
 Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
 Professor Howard Opdyke, Union, Schenectady, N. Y.
 Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Professor Paul C. Phillips, Amherst, Amherst, Mass.
 Professor W. F. R. Phillips, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Mr. William E. Schreiber, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Professor Richard U. Sherman, Hamilton, Clinton, N. Y.
 Professor A. Alonzo Stagg, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Professor Charles E. St. John, Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio, and Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
 Professor C. L. Thornburg, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.
 Dr. Robert G. Torrey, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Professor H. D. Wild, Williams, Williamstown, Mass.
 Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Professor H. Shindle Wingert, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Professor Joseph M. Wolfe, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.

2. Visiting delegates from institutions not members of the Association and additional delegate representatives from institutions represented by accredited delegates:

Professor L. W. Chaney, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
 Mr. B. W. Dickson, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.
 Mr. Milton Fairchild, Lecturer for Moral Education Board of Albany, N. Y.
 Director W. N. Golden, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 Professor James F. Kemp, Columbia University, New York City.
 Mr. John H. Leete, Carnegie Technical School, Pittsburg, Pa.
 Professor C. L. Maxcy, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
 Dr. J. H. McCurdy, Y. M. C. A. Training School, Springfield, Mass.
 Mr. Royce D. Purinton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
 Mr. Stanley J. Quinn, Fordham University, Fordham, New York City.
 Professor William H. Reese, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
 Dr. Percy L. Reynolds, University of Maine, Orono, Me.
 Mr. M. J. Thompson, Washington College, Chestertown, Md.
 Mr. Frank H. Wood, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

The President appointed as a committee on credentials, Professor Howard Opdyke, of Union College and Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., of Rutgers College, secretary.

The President announced that by order of the Executive Committee the morning session would be devoted to the reading and discussion of prepared papers, and the afternoon session to the business of the Association.

The first paper was read by President Palmer E. Pierce; subject, "The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States; its Origin, Growth, and Function." (See p. 27.) The subject was discussed by Professor A. A. Stagg, of the University of Chicago, and Professor W. A. Lambeth, of the University of Virginia.

The second paper was read by Professor James F. Kemp of Columbia University; subject, "The Proper Function in Athletics in Colleges and Universities." (See p. 33.) The discussion was opened by Professor H. D. Wild of Williams College, and continued by Professor Charles E. Houghton of New York University, Professor H. S. Chase of Tufts College, Dr. H. H.

Cloudman of the University of Vermont, and Professor George A. Hoadly of Swarthmore College.

The third paper was read by Dr. Luther H. Gulick, Director of Physical Training in the public schools of New York City; subject, "Amateurism." (See p. 40.) The discussion was opened by Professor C. W. Hetherington of the University of Missouri, and continued by Professor Craven Laycock of Dartmouth College.

The fourth paper by Professor Paul C. Phillips of Amherst College; subject, "The Length of Intercollegiate Athletic Schedules." (See p. 47.) The discussion was opened by Professor Louis Bevier, Jr. of Rutgers College, and continued by Professor Edwin Linton of Washington and Jefferson College.

The thanks of the Association were tendered to the writers of the above papers.

The President then declared an adjournment until 2.15 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention reassembled at 2.15 and the committee on credentials reported thirty-five duly accredited delegates present, as above recorded, constituting a quorum for business.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as printed and presented in pamphlet form.

The President appointed a committee on nominations consisting of Professor H. A. Peck, Professor Edwin Linton, Professor A. A. Stagg, Professor W. A. Lambeth, Professor W. D. Wild, Professor W. E. Metzenthin, and Captain H. J. Koehler.

Reports were received from the district representatives as follows:

FIRST DISTRICT.

PROFESSOR H. D. WILD OF WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

The New England colleges that are members of this Association have made no changes in their eligibility rules during the year, in the way either of additions or modifications. Last year several changes were reported, all in the direction of greater strictness. The colleges have been content with enforcing the existing rules, and apparently this has been done with care and with success.

On March 22 a conference of the five colleges on the summer baseball question was held at Springfield, Mass., each college being represented by two delegates. The sentiment there expressed was decidedly against any abolition of the present rule, although there was a feeling that the whole matter should be thoroughly investigated and that some plan should be devised to

make the rule more workable if possible, through modifications if necessary. A committee consisting of one representative from each of the colleges was appointed to get together comprehensive views and statistics, and to make recommendations. This committee met shortly afterwards to plan the campaign and has been working along the line proposed. The matter is still pending, but it is expected that a definite plan of action will be recommended soon. Whatever recommendations may be made will of course be referred to the individual colleges for their approval.

In this connection it is interesting to note that not long after the opening of the college year Dartmouth disqualified ten members of her baseball team under the existing rule governing the playing of baseball in the summer.

Although, as indicated, there has been no legislation in the matter of eligibility requirements, there have become evident signs of a tendency toward the reduction of the number of intercollegiate contests. The baseball schedules for the current year have not in all cases been arranged. But returns from three colleges show that in baseball the average number of games scheduled in 1906-7 was 21, with 11 of these played away from home, as against a total of 20, with nine of them away, scheduled for 1907-8, a decrease of one in the total and of two in the number of games away. Two of the colleges have made a decrease and in one no change has been made.

In football the average number of games for the five colleges has been very modest and very uniform throughout, eight for the season of 1906 and nine for the season of 1907, while the average number of games played away from home, four, is the same for the two years.

The basket ball schedules of the four colleges that have had the game show an average decrease in the total number of games from last year of one, from 18 in 1906-7 to 17 for the present year, and also a slight decrease in the number of games played or to be played away. A reduction has been made by three colleges and an increase by none. These statistics show a small decrease to be sure, but they are significant of a tendency toward conservatism.

The majority of the New England colleges are in favor of a movement looking toward the restriction of intercollegiate athletics. Along with this in some colleges at least there has sprung up an increase of interest in interclass and interfraternity games. The next step would seem to be a conference of the New England members of this Association with a view to taking concerted action in reducing schedules of intercollegiate athletic events to a uniform minimum.

There is also observable a growth of sentiment against the sys-

tem of professional coaching. Dartmouth has taken the lead by limiting herself for the present to the employment of alumni coaches, and other colleges are in sympathy with the idea as an end toward which to work. There are some indications too that the training-table system may before long cease to appeal even to students as an indispensable feature in college athletics.

By way of confirmation of published statements it may be said that whatever misunderstandings in connection with athletics may have sprung up during the year between different members of this Association in New England have been amicably adjusted.

Earnest effort has been made to increase membership in this Association among the New England colleges. The explanations for a certain reluctance to join on the part of some institutions, as given in the various letters received from their authorities, lead one to feel that in only two ways, and those followed reciprocally, can the desired growth in numbers be realized,—first, by a continued direct appeal made by this Association through actual results; second, by a willingness on the part of individual institutions to forward a general movement making for soundness of collegiate athletics, irrespective of local regulations or of individual gain.

SECOND DISTRICT.

PRESIDENT PALMER E. PIERCE, U. S. A.

The reports received from the various colleges of the district I have the honor to represent, indicate that in general the well known rules of eligibility of amateur sports are being more strictly enforced under the influence of this Association than ever before. It is found, however, that the rule against migration is not considered indispensable at some of our institutions; also that summer baseball players for hire are afterward permitted to play in intercollegiate matches. I judge that a strong sentiment is growing which will eventually put the college player who sells his athletic prowess in a class by himself. This does not mean ostracism but competition limited to his own professional class.

Some of the colleges of this district have the straight one year residence rule and others are adopting it. It works very satisfactorily in institutions that are large enough to make it at all practicable.

Some of our members report that they have adopted rules to carry out fully and strictly the "Principles of Amateur Sports," but will not make them apply to students already in college and playing in intercollegiate matches. In other words, they will not make retroactive laws, but will improve conditions by a natural

and healthy process. These institutions refer especially to the summer baseball player—that trying individual whose welfare we are to discuss to-day.

The first steps have been taken for the formation of a local league of colleges in Western Pennsylvania. Twenty-one colleges of this district now belong to the Intercollegiate Athletic Association. This is an increase of two over last year. It is urged that each of these institutions use every opportunity to increase our numbers. In unity is strength and all the ills of college athletics would be near solution if every college became an active partisan of this organization.

THIRD DISTRICT.

PROFESSOR W. L. DUDLEY OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

The collegiate athletic condition in the South is good and improving. The majority of the southern colleges are members of intercollegiate associations which enforce very satisfactory eligibility laws.

The Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association is the oldest, organized in 1893, and may be said to be the parent association. In South Carolina the colleges are banded together and are governed by the laws of the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association. The Kentucky colleges have their own association and the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the Southwest includes the colleges in Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

The only serious infraction of amateur rules during the past year was the result of a conspiracy on the part of some alumni of one institution to run in four or five football players. The plot was a success for a short while although the team was a failure so far as winning games was concerned. The conspiracy was discovered, the college suspended, but reinstated after a thorough investigation had shown that the athletic authorities there were not a party to the scheme.

For a number of years the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association has applied the one year rule to all athletes who transfer from one college to another and it has proved most helpful—but the necessity for the straight one year rule for all students has not been felt because there is very little attempt to influence the students in secondary schools in the selection of the institutions they may attend later. However, in some quarters there was demand for the one year rule. It was felt that the straight one year rule would be an injustice since there was such variation unfortunately in the entrance requirements of Southern

colleges, ranging from six to fifteen Carnegie Foundation Units. It was therefore decided that the one year rule be passed but not applying to students who enter college with fourteen or more units to their credit. This will tend, it is believed, to strengthen the secondary schools and raise the entrance requirements of some colleges.

The summer baseball problem is handled quite satisfactorily by the Southern Intercollegiate. A man who has played on a baseball team which is a member of any league is prohibited from playing, and no student can play on any team whatsoever in the summer except his home team, which is the team at the place where he resides and at which he has resided for one year, and he can receive no compensation whatsoever. By thus cutting the men out of all kinds of league teams, and confining their playing if they do any, to their home team which cannot be a member of any kind of a league, great or small, the evil is practically eliminated from college sport.

FOURTH DISTRICT.

PROFESSOR C. E. ST. JOHN OF OBERLIN COLLEGE.

The conditions in the fourth district, except in the state of Ohio, remain much as they were. In the states of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin, which are under the Western Conference and contain seven of the nine institutions of the Western Conference, there has been added one member of this Association, the University of Chicago, and there is strong probability of one or two more joining this Association. In the state of Ohio the Association has gained in membership by the joining of Case School of Applied Science, Kenyon College, Ohio State University, and Ohio University, making a total membership from Ohio of ten institutions. The Ohio Athletic Conference, originally an Association of five colleges, has been enlarged by the addition of three new members and is now open to any Ohio college or university that will adopt and enforce the regulations of the Conference. The Ohio Athletic Conference has been recognized by the Association of Presidents and Deans as the athletic authority in the state.

Throughout the territory covered by this report the three year rule is enforced by all the Conference colleges and the one year residence rule for freshmen, and for all migrants. The training table and pre-season training has been done away with, and all graduates or holders of a bachelor's degree are debarred, thus making intercollegiate athletics purely undergraduate sport.

In the Western Conference the question of officials has been

very successfully dealt with by a central committee and in this considerable gain has been made in that direction but the matter has not yet been satisfactorily settled.

In both conferences an honest effort is made to control and regulate the perplexing question of summer baseball. The sentiment for preserving the amateur principles is growing and is the prevailing sentiment in a majority of the institutions in these conferences.

FIFTH DISTRICT.

The representative of the fifth district rendered a brief verbal report, indicating satisfactory progress during the year.

SIXTH DISTRICT.

C. W. HETHERINGTON OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

It is to be regretted that so few institutions of the sixth district are members of this Association. Though the district includes the area covered by several large states and includes many colleges, there are only two members. From personal canvass this year it seems that membership will be increased only through the work of local associations.

Intercollegiate athletic relations in the sixth district are influenced seriously by the great distances between institutions. This fact is emphasized by several geographical characteristics. The great arid plains of western Nebraska, Kansas and Texas isolate the colleges to the west and drive the intercollegiate relations of institutions in these states northward and eastward. In these relations the poor railroad facilities north and south between the state universities render schedule making doubly difficult. Any intercollegiate game between the state universities of Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, etc., involves at least a three days' trip, with corresponding costs. These conditions have made it difficult to bring the institutions of the district together on any basis of unity. Fellowship grows slowly over such great distances. Furthermore the money factor in schedule making has been too important. Many times during the last seven years this influence has checked upward tendencies as is the case in other sections of the country. The lessons in the schedules of the last football season however have been salutary. We seem about to be freed from the disgraceful and notorious newspaper discussions incident to games with institutions that support teams purely for advertising and gambling purposes.

The most notable item of progress in this district was the for-

mation last February of the Missouri Valley Conference of Faculty Representatives. Up to that time college athletics in the Mississippi had been dominated by two organizations: the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives which began its work in 1895 and the Intercollegiate Association of the Southwest formed in Texas in 1903-04. The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the Southwest, because of distances, had little influence north. The Intercollegiate Conference, or the so-called Big Nine, felt that its organization was large enough, therefore a number of institutions between the districts of these two associations, which could not become members of the Intercollegiate Conference, and which were barred from satisfactory membership in the Southwestern Association, were left unorganized. Since 1900 the Intercollegiate Conference Rules under the leadership of Missouri University have been generally enforced in these institutions, but it was not until last February that the district was organized.

Naturally the new organization is a copy of the Intercollegiate Conference, and the rules are the same as those of the Intercollegiate Conference, though slightly less stringent, especially in the retroactive clauses. The new conference includes Iowa University, which is also a member of the Intercollegiate Conference, Missouri University, Kansas University, and Washington University in St. Louis. The Missouri Valley district covers southern Nebraska and Iowa, Kansas and Missouri, Oklahoma and Arkansas. Several other institutions will be taken during the coming year.

The three associations of the Mississippi Valley referred to above overlap in their jurisdiction: all locally organized districts must necessarily overlap. No better illustration could be given than these three overlapping districts of the need of national uniformity in eligibility regulations, of the need of intercollegiate agreements on modes of procedure in intercollegiate relations, and of the need of agreements on policies in internal administration. Institutions on the border line of these districts must go over in the adjoining district for competition. If the rules of the two districts are different the intercollegiate relations are difficult and dangerous. Hence, we feel that the growth in strength of natural local associations will give strength to the cause of the National Association. We must have local associations. They must be unified gradually in the National Association.

In standards and regulations some of the institutions of the sixth district are very advanced, as high as any in the United States, some are exceedingly backward, one or two lack even the elements of decency. These great differences in standards are exaggerating the local difficulties because of distances. Another

drag is the sympathy with professionalism on the part of many metropolitan papers. The present situation and tendencies in the district is on the whole exceptionally encouraging.

BASKET BALL COMMITTEE REPORT AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED.

President Pierce serving as a sub-committee of the executive committee on basket ball submitted the following report which was received and ordered filed.

After investigation and discussion of the subject with many authorities and players, your committee wrote the following letter to the chairman of the Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee:

MARCH 21, 1907.

*Mr. Harry A. Fisher, Chairman,
Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee,
1 West Thirty-fourth Street, New York City.*

Dear Mr. Fisher.—At the annual conference of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association held in New York City December 29, 1906, the executive committee was instructed to look into the subject of basket ball and adopt such means as might seem advisable to secure a uniform set of rules for playing this game. At a subsequent meeting of the executive committee I was appointed by the committee to take up this matter.

As a result of my investigations I have the honor to submit the following propositions to you and the fellow members of your Basket Ball Rules Committee. These suggestions are for the purpose of securing one set of rules under which the colleges and universities shall play in future.

SUGGESTIONS.

First—It seems advisable to me that the Basket Ball Rules Committee should be expanded so as to represent more thoroughly all sections of our country. For this purpose I propose for your consideration that additional members be received, namely; one representative from some southern college or university, to be decided on later. Another representative from West Point; for this latter I suggest the name of Lieutenant Stillwell who is known to you as an authority on basket ball, who has played the game and who has officiated in many contests.

I suggest that the member to represent the South shall come

from the University of Missouri, where I know the game has received a great deal of attention. The name of the representative can be decided on later.

Second. It is my strong conviction that the interpretation and enforcement of rules of basket ball should be in the hands of better officials. In order to accomplish this I suggest that steps be taken to form a list of persons who are able and competent to officiate in basket ball games. It should also be decreed that officials for games should be neutral.

Third. After talking with the representatives of the A. A. U. I am convinced that the Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules are not suitable for athletic club, Y. M. C. A., and schoolboy players. It therefore seems well to retain a distinction between the rules for these different classes. In order to avoid trouble and adverse comments that arise from playing games under rules with which college players are not familiar, I suggest that it be understood that college players shall not arrange games with any of the above mentioned classes. When games are played by us under the A. A. U. rules a great many fouls are called, all largely due, no doubt, to unintentional violation of the requirements of the strange rules. I have seen many accounts in newspapers of games in which uncomplimentary remarks are made of the college players on account of the numerous fouls awarded against them. Such occurrences are very apt to bring college players of basket ball into disrepute and I strongly advise that no games be played outside of our own class.

I suggest that your committee use its influence to bring this about and our Association will do all in its power to accomplish the same end.

Finally, allow me to congratulate you and your co-workers on the excellent set of rules which you have formulated for playing this very interesting and valuable game. I think there are a few changes that can be made in these rules to the advantage of basket ball, but I believe the committee is able to deal with the subject in a thoroughly satisfactory manner. The criticism I have heard from outside sources is that our game is too rough, and I think this objection can be overcome, provided the rules are efficiently enforced and penalties are made somewhat stricter than they now are for intentional roughness.

The college country owes you and your fellow workers a hearty vote of thanks for the excellent game you have evolved. It seems to me that it is rapidly becoming one of the major sports of our colleges and I trust that it can be properly controlled.

If your committee will agree to the suggestions of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association as named above I am sure we can

secure the desirable result of having one set of basket ball rules for playing this game in all of the colleges and universities of the country. For my part I will take such steps as may be necessary to bring about the playing of this game by all institutions which belong to the Intercollegiate Athletic Association without any change whatever in the rules.

Yours very sincerely,

PALMER E. PIERCE,

Captain 13th Infantry, U. S. Army, President.

As a result of the negotiations thus inaugurated the Basket Ball Rules Committee was increased by Lieutenant Stillwell, West Point, Mr. Anderson, University of Missouri, and Mr. Appell of Williams.

Legislation was enacted to bar out as much unnecessary roughness as possible. Steps have also been taken to form a list of satisfactory officials.

Your committee feels that a beginning has been made in the right direction of sane and wise control of this chief of indoor competition sports. It would urge all institutions to limit, as much as possible, schedules to teams representing academic institutions. This is a matter your committee feels deserves your deepest consideration. Mr. James E. Sullivan, President of the Amateur Athletic Union, also urges this most strongly. To do so might limit the holiday tours of your basket ball teams, but would this be an unmixed evil?

Finally, it is recommended that the Basket Ball Rules Committee be invited to come under the jurisdiction of this Association which will bear the expenses of its maintenance. A new by-law should be proposed similar to the one submitted in the case of football. I believe this Basket Ball Rules Committee will gladly welcome the invitation to become a representative organization with this Association back of it.

The following resolutions offered by the executive committee were unanimously adopted:

1. That authority be granted the executive committee to form a representative Basket Ball Rules Committee. This committee to consist for 1908 of the present members, viz., Mr. R. B. Hyatt, Yale; Mr. Ralph Morgan, University of Pennsylvania; Mr. Harry A. Fisher, Columbia; Mr. O. DeG. Vanderbilt, Princeton; Lieutenant Joseph Stillwell, West Point; Mr. Anderson, University of Missouri; Mr. Appell, Williams; Mr. Angell, Wisconsin; and Dr. Raycroft, Chicago. That said committee be formed and maintained by this Association provided it consents to act as a rep-

representative basket ball rules-making committee for 1908 carrying on the work in the excellent manner inaugurated by it.

2. That the executive committee prepare a by-law for submission to this Association providing for the election of a basket ball rules committee to serve in subsequent years.

3. The executive committee strongly recommend the following resolutions to the convention:

a. That basket ball be recognized as a college sport and that it be controlled and safeguarded as other intercollegiate games.

b. That college basket ball teams limit their games as much as possible to teams representing institutions of learning.

c. That where college basket ball teams play athletic club, Y. M. C. A. or other teams, they do so only under the rules and requirements of the A. A. U.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP.

The special committee to secure the membership of the larger universities, appointed at the preceding convention, and consisting of President Pierce, Dr. H. L. Williams, Dr. James A. Babbitt made the following report:

After due consideration by the committee the following letter was sent to the institutions concerned:

Dear Sir:

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the Report of the Annual Conference of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association and a copy of a circular letter sent out with the same. These documents may have come to your attention previously, but it is requested, however, that you again give to them serious consideration.

It is the earnest desire of our Association that your institution should be enrolled in its membership. This is desired in order that new impetus may be given to the movement for better conditions in college athletics by the prestige and influence that will come from your joining in the work.

The Association has been doing work long enough for its methods to be well established. An examination of the annual report will show the remarkable freedom that the conference had from incriminations of any kind whatever. The Association is one from which any institution can withdraw whenever it sees fit. Therefore, your institution will lose none of its independence if it should join us in the work.

That this work is important enough to justify the existence of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association, embracing all the universities and colleges of the land, is more apparent as time goes on. The benefit arising from elevating the standard of college athletics in all our schools will be most incalculable.

You are again urged to join us in the wider effort to improve conditions of college athletics throughout the whole land.

On page 26 of the enclosed report of the Annual Conference of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association, appears the authority of a committee named to endeavor to find a basis on which your institution will become a member of this Association.

This committee is given authority to revise Article V of the by-laws if this will secure your membership. By reference to this article it will be seen to contain directions for the formation of the Football Rules Committee. It was the consensus of opinion of the delegates at the annual meeting that this article should be so amended that your institution should name one member of the Rules Committee, provided it join this Association.

This same proposition will be made to the other institutions formerly represented on the Old Football Rules Committee, except those recently represented, viz.: Chicago and Annapolis. It is proposed that Professor Dashiell and Mr. Stagg be members as long as they care to serve. The proposition, then, is that the members of the old committee be continued as above indicated, and, in addition, seven others be elected to represent the other institutions of this Association.

The idea is to make plain to you our desire to secure your membership for no other purpose than the betterment of college athletics throughout the country. There is no selfish motive, such as a desire to get control of the Football Committee. We want representation, but not control. We want the committee to be a representative one that will act for the best interests of the great body of college students of our land.

It is also proposed to so change the by-law that the representatives of the present members of this Association shall hold office for at least two years. It is thought that a longer term will lead to more efficient work.

All these changes will be embodied in a new article if you will signify the intention of your institution to join us. The copy will be sent you for approval before being acted upon.

Some of the reasons for the existence of a national organization are given in the circular letter. At the present time the executive committee is endeavoring to better the conditions in basket ball and baseball. An educational campaign in the principles of athletic amateurism is being planned. Active encouragement is being

given the formation of local alliances among colleges for the good of college sports.

We feel that we are doing beneficial work for the uplifting of athletics among students. That this work is necessary may be seen from the remarks of the president of the Amateur Athletic Union, given on page 24 of the report. Your athletics, no doubt, are properly controlled, but we need your powerful influence to assist in elevating them throughout the country.

An early and favorable reply to this communication is hoped for. If desired, I will be pleased to meet you at any place and hour convenient to explain any matters upon which you may wish further information.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) PALMER E. PIERCE,

Captain 13th U. S. Infantry, President.

After a certain amount of correspondence and personal interviews the following changes in our Constitution and By-Laws were proposed for adoption on condition that Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Cornell and Annapolis indicate their intention of joining this Association.

To Article VIII of the Constitution :

SECTION 1. As the article now reads.

SEC. 2. That Colleges and Universities enrolled in this Association are bound by the provisions of its Constitution and By-Laws. But legislation enacted at a conference of delegates shall not be binding upon any institution if the proper athletic authority of said institution makes formal objection to the same. Such formal objection shall be filed with the Secretary of the Executive Committee.

To Article V of the By-Laws (so as to read as follows) :

SECTION 1. The Association at its annual convention shall choose a committee of seven (7) to draw up rules for the playing of the game of football during the succeeding season in conjunction with one representative named by the authorized athletic authorities of Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Cornell, and Pennsylvania respectively, and the members representing Chicago and Annapolis on the 1907 Rules Committee.

SEC. 2. Of the seven members chosen by this Association, three shall be elected for three years, two for two years, and two for one year at the annual meeting in 1907. Thereafter the election shall be for terms of three years as the vacancies occur.

SEC. 3. Nominations for the committee shall be submitted at

the annual convention by the Executive Committee. Other nominations may be made from the floor.

SEC. 4. The Football Rules Committee shall make a report to the annual convention on the rules of play adopted and their practical working during the preceding season.

These proposed changes were sent with a letter of transmittal during June and all the institutions acknowledged their receipt, but stated consideration would necessarily be delayed until fall.

On October 20th another letter was written asking definite action since due notice must be given of proposed changes in our constitution and by-laws. No reply has as yet been received from Yale or Princeton. Harvard and Cornell find it inadvisable to join us, and Annapolis has the matter under consideration.

Your Committee recommends the continuance of these efforts to induce these important institutions to join this Association. It believes that the necessity and practicability of a national reorganization will soon become apparent.

By vote of the Association the above report was received and the Committee continued.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE RULES COMMITTEE.

Dr. H. L. Williams, as Chairman of the representative Football Rules Committee, made the following report:

It gives me pleasure to report that the committee on rules, elected by you at the last annual convention, was again able to join forces with the old rules committee, which included representatives from Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Cornell, Pennsylvania, Annapolis and Chicago, and that these two committees have worked together during the past year under the most cordial relationship and complete harmony as one committee, designated as the American Intercollegiate Football Rules Committee.

As the personnel of the two committees has remained practically the same since the original consolidation, but a single change having taken place in each, the American Intercollegiate Football Rules committee may be considered to have worked together as a unit now for two years.

It may then be of interest to consider briefly what has been accomplished by the committee during this period in its efforts to revise the rules and improve the game. After an amalgamation between the two committees had been accomplished, a somewhat detailed report of which was made to you last year, the real work of the committee began.

Following your instruction your committee has conscientiously labored to introduce such changes in the rules as would bring about a more open game, cut out the so-called mass play and eliminate unnecessary roughness and unsportsmanlike conduct.

The accession of the new committee to the old was more than welcomed by the latter, once the conjunction had been accomplished. Under the regime of the old committee the rules could not be changed without a unanimous vote. For two years the old committee had seen that the public was demanding a change and had made efforts to meet this demand, but each time ran against the stone wall rule requiring a unanimous vote. Mr. Camp had sought to introduce the 10-yard rule as a cure-all, and objected to other changes, while other members on the old committee clearly saw that the 10-yard rule alone, without other modifications to both strengthen the attack and weaken the defense, would well nigh ruin all offensive tactics and reduce American football to a duel of punters. Under these conditions the new committee was received and the two committees amalgamated. A majority vote of the members present was made decisive and a practical working basis at once established.

Hard work was begun immediately and a large number of meetings held in New York during the winter and early spring of 1906 and in the winter of 1907. It was during the first year of its existence that the most radical and sweeping changes were introduced into the rules and came into effect during the fall of 1906.

In revising the rules many difficulties confronted the committee. In order to make the games more open it was felt that a greater distance to gain should be required and a gain of 10 yards in three downs, as proposed by Mr. Camp, was one of the first changes agreed upon. With this as a basis for revision other changes in the play were gradually elaborated.

To further eliminate mass play and prevent the heavy grinding into the line from which only short gains usually resulted, a rule was formed which forbade drawing back of the line in the formations any of the five heavy center men. It was further ruled that at least six men should always remain on the line of scrimmage. This still permitted drawing one of the ends back in a formation, thus retaining great possibilities in variety of offensive tactics. Up to this point it is readily seen the offense only had been dealt with. Scoring had been rendered vastly more difficult both by doubling the distance to be gained and by forcing the heavy line men to remain on the line of scrimmage on the offense. It was realized by the committee that under these conditions the offense would be entirely incompetent to cope with the defense and that games would become largely kicking

duels, uncertain in results, less interesting to its public and less satisfactory to the players themselves.

Various plans of weakening the defense by requiring a number of men to remain a given distance behind the line until the ball should be snapped, were considered and rejected, on account of the difficulties foreseen in their practical enforcement.

To force the defense to automatically spread out over the field and weaken its line, in order to adequately repel the attack and defend its territory, was felt to be the great desideratum. To accomplish this weakening of the defense and at the same time give the offense, which had been drastically restricted, more latitude, the *forward pass* and the *onside kick* were introduced. Both of these measures were proposed and advocated by members of your committee, and finally passed, not without long debate and against opposition, which was at first strenuous. These four radical changes just enumerated, constitute the essence of the technical alteration which have been introduced since your committee came into existence. Many other changes in the rules, less sweeping in character, but none the less important in the aggregate, have also been incorporated in the new code, with the purpose of eliminating unsportsmanlike conduct and unnecessary roughness. Duties of the officials have been slightly changed and more clearly defined, so that the rule might be more readily and rigidly enforced. The old rules were found to be in many cases obscure, difficult to interpret precisely, and withal poorly arranged. A re-codification has been carefully and ably made during the past year by Mr. H. K. Hall, one of the members of your committee, so that the rules stand to-day in far better form than ever before. This has been a most important and valuable piece of work.

As Chairman of the Central Board of Officials, a sub-committee of the Rules Committee, Dr. Babbitt has discharged arduous duties for two years, requiring much time and diplomacy. His labors have raised the standard of officiating throughout the east and been of service to a large number of colleges.

Your committee realizes that some of the rules as they now stand have not met with satisfaction in all quarters. Particularly has the forward pass been made the subject of considerable discussion. The principal criticism of this feature of the new game seems to come from the so-called larger colleges. It is this rule more than any other which gives the light, fast and often versatile teams of the smaller colleges a possible chance to score on, and win from, heavier and physically more powerful opponents.

During the past fall the use of the forward pass has been greatly developed and in some cases over developed. Some of the larger teams not realizing its dangers, particularly in the early

season, presented a defense too much along old lines, and inadequate to meet the requirements of the new game. As time and experience make the possibilities of this feature of football better known, the defense will be correspondingly developed to meet it. It is the belief of the majority of your committee that the forward pass is an important feature of the present game, and that whereas it may be subjected to slight modification it will not be eliminated or changed essentially.

REPORT TO THE INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE.

Dr. James A. Babbitt, as Chairman of the Sub-committee on Football Officials, made the following report:

Your representative on the Rules Committee entrusted with the mission of furthering the efficient enforcement of the rules and elimination of objectionable features in football, would respectfully report the following as to the work of the Central Board of Officials, appointed by the Rules Committee.

During the past season the work of this board was extended to include the New England States and somewhat over 800 officials were appointed under its complete jurisdiction.

In April a revised list of accredited officials was issued, not including the south and far west, as the central organization was not there perfected. In June an important meeting of football managers was held in New York City, endorsing the work of the previous year under the direction of the Board and requesting its continuance and extension.

In September, three important meetings were held: the first of the Central Board and special invited representatives of the larger colleges; the second of all football managers in the Eastern Section to consummate plans for the year and finally one of officials in conference upon points of interpretation and attended by some fifty of the strongest officials of the country.

Subsequent to this, a special pamphlet of interpretations was issued and freely distributed. The Conference Committee in the west, meanwhile, there continued the work of the Central selection of officials for all important games as inaugurated the year before.

The results of the reform have been manifold. Officials have been appointed on the basis of superiority and have been enabled to render neutral service.

Officials have been held strictly to appointments and terms of agreement.

The fees have been in general somewhat reduced but have reached a general uniformity.

Valuable data as to suggestions and corrections of the football rules have been collected to aid the Rules Committee in its work.

A uniform interpretation upon doubtful points has been generally secured.

By perfecting the Central Organization the whole football system and situation has been strengthened and public opinion manifested increasing approval.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SUMMER BASEBALL.

Professor C. W. Hetherington, chairman of the sub-committee on summer baseball, presented an elaborate report, collating expressions of opinion from colleges and universities in all parts of the country, and discussing all the principles involved. The report, presented in printed form, was received and ordered filed, and the following resolutions submitted by the executive committee were unanimously adopted:

Believing that it is important to keep all college athletics from any taint of professionalism and the playing of baseball in summer for gain is distinctly opposed to the principles of amateurism, on which all student athletics should rest:

Believing also, as a result of the investigation of the committee on summer baseball that the matter can be successfully controlled when taken seriously and when supported by an enlightened sentiment such as the effort in the intercollegiate conference colleges and the Southern Intercollegiate Association, etc., we make the following recommendations:

That the principle of amateurism be maintained in all branches of college athletics:

That the athletic authorities of colleges and universities be urged to create an educated sentiment in favor of the amateur ideal:

That in view of the complex nature of the situation in connection with summer baseball and the need for further investigation, the present committee be continued:

That inasmuch as this whole matter is far-reaching and vitally affects the athletic interests of other organizations we request the coöperation of the National Association of Secondary Schools, the Playgrounds Association of America, the Amateur Athletic Union, the Athletic League of North America and other national associations of a similar character.

Further resolutions were presented by the Executive Committee as follows:

Whereas, the constitution of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States pledges all the constituent colleges and universities to maintain in student athletic sports "a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play and to remedy what abuses may exist."

Therefore, be it resolved that:

While the responsibility for the details of rules rests with the individual institution, the Association expects a bona fide enforcement of the principles of amateur sport on the part of its members and invites a report to its Executive Committee for investigation and appropriate action; and resolved

That complaints against any institution which is a member of this Association should not be based on mere rumor but should relate to matters of fact which the complainant feels able to prove by presenting specific evidence to the Executive Committee.

These resolutions, after a full discussion, in which, among others, Dr. Cloudman of the University of Virginia, Director W. N. Golden of the Pennsylvania State College, Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., of Rutgers College, Dr. R. G. Torrey of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. H. L. Williams of the University of Minnesota, Professor W. E. Metzenthin of the University of Texas, and Professor A. A. Stagg of the University of Chicago took part, were referred back to the Executive Committee for further consideration.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr. of Rutgers College, reported as Secretary on the circular letters and literature which had been issued during the present year and on the growth in the enrollment of the Association.

As Treasurer he reported total receipts of \$1453.82, of which \$1316.62 had been paid out to meet the expenses of administration and the personal expenses of members of the Executive and Football Rules Committees, leaving a balance in the treasury of \$107.20 and unpaid bills amounting to about \$100; and that his accounts had been duly audited and his vouchers examined and found to be correct by Professor C. W. Hetherington, designated as a Committee on Audit by President Pierce. The report was received and ordered filed.

The Executive Committee submitted the following proposed amendments to the Constitution, which were adopted without a dissenting vote.

(a) To Article VI of the Constitution:

SEC. 3. Two or more colleges or universities may be represented by one delegate. This delegate shall be entitled to one vote only, except on questions or motions for which he has definite, written instructions from the proper authorities of the institutions represented. In the latter case he shall be entitled to as many votes as he has written instructions, provided the said delegate votes for each institution as instructed on the matter at issue.

(b) To Article VIII of the Constitution:

SEC. 1. As the article now reads.

SEC. 2. That colleges and universities enrolled in this Association are bound by the provisions of its Constitution and By-Laws. But legislation enacted at a conference of delegates shall not be binding upon any institution if the proper athletic authority of said institution makes formal objection to the same. Such formal objection shall be submitted in writing to the Executive Committee.

An additional amendment as follows:

"SEC. 4. Two or more colleges and universities may maintain a joint membership represented by one delegate. This delegate shall be entitled to one vote only;" proposed by Professor L. W. Chaney of Carleton College, was referred to the Executive Committee for consideration and report at a future convention.

The Executive Committee nominated the following as members of the representative Football Rules Committee for the year 1908, inviting other nominations from the floor if delegates desired to make any change in the suggested list:

Dr. James A. Babbitt, Haverford College.
Lieutenant H. B. Hackett, United States Military Academy.
Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Mr. E. K. Hall, Dartmouth College.
Professor James T. Lees, University of Nebraska.
Mr. C. W. Savage, Oberlin College.
Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.

By unanimous vote of the Association the nominations were closed and the nominees of the Executive Committee duly elected.

The following resolution was adopted for the guidance of the Football Rules Committee: That the Committee for 1908 be composed of seven members and be directed to act as follows:

First. To communicate with the representatives of Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Annapolis, and Chicago University, who constituted the committee that formed

the Football Rules Committee during 1905, and propose that the committee be amalgamated into one which shall formulate rules under which football shall be played during 1908.

Second. If this amalgamation be not accomplished then the above named committee of seven shall proceed to formulate rules under which football shall be played by institutions enrolled in this Association.

Third. That the seven members elected by this conference shall direct in their action so as to secure the following:

- (a) An open game.
- (b) Elimination of rough and brutal playing.
- (c) Definite and precise rules of play.
- (d) Organization and control of officials in order that the rules shall be strictly and impartially enforced.

The Committee on Nominations reported the following as nominees to hold office for the ensuing year:

For President, Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A.
 Vice President, Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University.
 Secretary, Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College.
 Treasurer, Professor W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia.

For District Representatives:

First District, Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
 Second District, Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College.
 Third District, Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
 Fourth District, Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
 Fifth District, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
 Sixth District, Captain Palmer E. Pierce, Fort Leavenworth, Kan.

It was unanimously voted that the Secretary cast the ballot for the above nominees, and the ballot being cast they were declared duly elected.

President Pierce presented his resignation on the ground of removal from West Point and active service in the army, being now stationed at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. It was moved and unanimously carried that the resignation be not accepted.

Votes of thanks were passed to the officials, to the members of the Football Rules Committee, to Dr. James A. Babbitt for his services as head of the Sub-committee on Football Officials, to the Officers of the Association, and to the members of the Executive Committee for the efficient conduct of the business of the Association during the past year.

The Association thereupon adjourned to meet at the call of the Executive Committee.

THE INTERNATIONAL ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

ITS ORIGIN, GROWTH AND FUNCTION.*

CAPTAIN PALMER E. PIERCE, U. S. A., PRESIDENT.

The year 1905 was memorable in the athletic world on account of a campaign waged against the various abuses that had grown up in college athletics. Newspapers were filled with articles reflecting, not only on the methods of play in various sports, but also on the amateur status of many members of prominent college teams. Even the magazines took part in the discussion, and the need of change and reform in our supposedly amateur college athletics was emphasized by citing specific examples of proselytizing, of prominent college players not really amateurs, and of the various covert forms of payment to certain men for their athletic services. It was related in detail under what disguise money returns were given. For instance, one prominent player was said to have derived hundreds of dollars from the privilege of furnishing programs for games; another received the profit from a special brand of cigarettes named after him; a third was the ostensible head of an eating club, while still others were in the private employ of rich college graduates.

The use of athletic prowess for personal gain was said to be a widespread practice and it was hinted, if not directly stated, that the college authorities were cognizant of these violations of the principles of amateur sports.

Even the past history of many of the prominent athletes was brought before the public and their character as men of truth and as gentlemen was severely attacked. In a word it was claimed that many professional athletes were parading under false college colors.

This sweeping condemnation of the prevalent ethics of college athletics inaugurated a strong movement to reform the manner of playing the leading intercollegiate sports. Exaggerated accounts were published of disagreeable incidents of such contests, and the accidents that occurred were chronicled to the least detail.

The game of football was under a special fire of criticism. The rules of play were severely handled by the public press. The

*Read before the Second Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, New York City, December 28, 1907.

Football Rules Committee was charged with being a self-constituted, self-perpetuating and irresponsible body, which, in order to make the rules more favorable to the playing material available at particular institutions, had degraded a once noble sport to the plane of a brutal gladiatorial contest.

Attention was called to the exaggerated prominence of athletics in college life, to the undue amount of time devoted to them, and to the degeneration of intercollegiate contests to a form of gladiatorial struggle for which a limited number of men were prepared by weeks of careful training, and at which the remainder of the student body acted like savages in the wild excitement of victory or defeat.

Finally, even the stage joined in the outcry. In one of the greatest comedy successes of the season, "The College Widow," the peculiar foibles of college athletic life were strongly portrayed. In this play a prominent character is the shrewd trainer whose business it was to find material for and to develop winning teams. The production of the wonderful new candidate for center, the giant dragged from the blacksmith forge to take a course in "Art" at college, was a typical bit of the comedy. Thousands of spectators laughed at this farce and had their ideas of modern college life and sports very much lowered by it. If this comedy had a moral it was based on the assumption that American college men, graduates and under-graduates alike, practically hold victory in athletic sports as well as in the affairs of life, no matter how obtained, to be the one thing worth while.

This agitation finally reached such a height that in December, 1905, a national convention of representatives from the universities and colleges of the United States was called to consider the subject of college athletics, especially football. The interest in the movement was great enough to induce sixty-eight institutions from all parts of the country to send delegates. As to football two propositions soon became prominent; the one was to abolish the game, the other to reform it. The conservative counsel finally prevailed, and a Football Rules Committee of seven was selected.

The success of this movement for football reform is too well known to need further comment except to say that the conference directed its football representatives to amalgamate with the old committee if possible, but whether this was accomplished or not, they should endeavor to secure the following results in their football legislation: 1. An open game. 2. Elimination of rough and brutal play. 3. Efficient enforcement of rules of play. 4. Organization of permanent body of officials. The amalgamation was accomplished, and the work of the whole committee has since

been satisfactory and efficient. Without this addition of new members to the Rules Committee, it is very doubtful if any material changes in the old rushing game would have been effected.

An executive committee was elected by the convention, and directed to take the necessary steps to form a permanent organization. The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States resulted from the work of this executive committee.

During 1906, thirty-eight institutions definitely ratified the constitution and joined the organized movement for a sane control of college athletics. To-day the membership has increased to fifty, an increase that certainly promises well for the future of the organization.

The purpose of this Association is, as set forth in its constitution, the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States, in order that the athletic activities in the colleges and universities may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education. All institutions enrolled as members agree to take control of student athletic sports, so far as may be necessary, to maintain in them a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play, and to remedy whatever abuses may exist.

The first meeting of the new organization was held in New York City, December 28, 1906, at which forty universities and colleges were represented. Reports were received from seven delegates representing the various districts into which the United States had been divided. The consensus of opinion was that college athletics had been much improved during 1906 as a result of the reform movement which had culminated in the National Conference of the previous year. One prominent educator remarked that "there was already a higher amateur standard throughout the country and that the remarkable amalgamation of the old Football Rules Committee marked a distinct triumph for the Association, resulting not so much in changing the rules, although in that respect a noteworthy improvement had been made, but even more in a better public sentiment, in a higher grade of officials, and in general, in a more sportsmanlike standard of fairness on the part of the players."

Does it seem then from the above short relation of the formation and accomplishments of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States that such an organization was desirable? Does a need for it still exist?

The necessity of a widely organized effort to raise college sports to a higher plane and keep them there must be evident to every one who gives the subject proper consideration. The

spirit which justifies victory by any means, fair or foul, is still too rampant, and a great educational movement to correct this is of the highest consequence. The effect upon the national character of permitting intercollegiate contests to be conducted under false pretenses; of considering victory alone, and not the means of gaining it; of looking with a favoring eye upon concealed proselyting and professionalism; of thinking continually of winning, instead of the sport itself, and of depreciating legitimate academic work in favor of athletics, must be admitted to be seriously bad. The average American young man is already prone enough to indulge the spirit of rivalry; enamoured enough of the end to be gained irrespective of the means, without having these tendencies increased by unfair play and low standards of sportsmanship on his athletic fields. There can be no question but that a boy or young man, who is habituated to the endeavor to win games by means, some of which he knows to be unfair and against the rules, later will play the game of life with the same ethical standards.

The high standard of university athletics in England is largely due to the controlling and directing influence of English educators. The tutor of that country is a guide to the students, not only on the intellectual, but also on the physical side. Such men as the late Leslie Stevens have had an incalculable influence on the national life by their advocacy of fair play and true sportsmanship on the English playgrounds. The same inference can become effective in the United States only by the concerted efforts of educators, working through national organizations. This country is too large, its interests too divergent, and the tutorial system too infrequent for the English method of directing youthful athletic activities to be effective.

A national organization of universities and colleges is needed, but to be truly effective, it must have a sufficient membership to be truly national. It may justly claim the coöperation of all college and university faculties which have at heart national control of athletics, for the elimination of abuses, and the better utilization of the innate love of manly sports in the upbuilding of strong and vigorous manhood.

The Association hopes to accomplish its purpose largely by educational means. It is endeavoring to disseminate throughout the great mass of college students of our land, true ideas of what amateur sport really is, to establish well defined notions of its principles, and to obtain strict adhesion to them. "Sport for Sport's Sake" might well be its motto. This organization wages no war against the professional athlete, but it does object to such a one posing and playing as an amateur. It smiles on the

square, manly, skillful contestant, imbued with love of the contest he wages; it frowns on the more skillful professional who, parading under college colors, is receiving pay in some form or other for his athletic prowess.

This Association does not require acceptance of any particular set of eligibility rules. It does, however, bind its members to line up to the well known principles of amateur sport. It does not take from any institution its independence, except independence for violation of the ethics of amateur athletics. It does not interfere with the formation of local leagues of two or more allied institutions, rather it encourages such. In a word, this is a league of educated gentlemen who are trying to exercise a wise control over college athletics, believing that the good effect will react on every playground of every schoolhouse of the United States.

It may well be asked how a national organization can be expected to accomplish the work of collegiate athletic reform that still needs to be done. If it becomes truly national in scope it can certainly contribute to this end in many ways. It may become:

1. A clearing house of athletic ideas for the whole country.
2. A central bureau of propaganda concerning college athletics:
 - (a) By report of meetings.
 - (b) By newspaper statements of aims and policies.
 - (c) By personal contact of members, committees and delegates.
 - (d) By circulars and other published literature.
3. An agency of practical reform:
 - (a) By suggesting and urging methods of purifying athletics.
 - (b) By establishing, or helping to establish, needed rules of play for certain college sports.
 - (c) By becoming a strong, central authority on college athletics.

Already its influence has become profound. It has not endeavored to control by force of authority. Its work has been suggestive. I should regret to see any other means become necessary. However, I believe the Association will develop slowly along the best lines suitable for control of athletics in its own field of work.

In conclusion it may be stated that this organization was born of necessity. It has grown and developed by a process of evolution. Without it there would be no unity of purpose, no representative rules committees, no organized effort to uplift college athletics throughout the United States. By its agency college

athletics should be so elevated that the good in them will be preserved, and the evil destroyed."

To accomplish these aims, organization is as necessary as in any business effort. A year ago the President of the Amateur Athletic Union wrote: "From an athletic standpoint, the colleges lack organization. There is too much a desire 'to play in its own backyard' and go it alone." This Association has grown since then; it has become more national in character but it still lacks much of the support it should have. However, I firmly believe it will finally dominate the college athletic world. It stands for purity, for rational control, for fair play. As its aims and methods become better understood, its strength will grow until its influence will become truly national.

THE PROPER FUNCTION OF ATHLETICS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.*

PROF. JAMES F. KEMP, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

The subject set for my paper is not the easiest one in the world to discuss in a way at once satisfactory and efficient in results. I wish neither to be destructively critical, leading to no practical result, nor purely general and mushy, glossing over my honest convictions. Athletics in our colleges and universities and their attendant intercollegiate contests are taken with enormous and rather supersensitive seriousness by our alumni and students. While this is in some respects one of their most objectionable aspects, yet in others, it is an expression of loyalty and devotion to alma mater that has its good side, and no officer of instruction would wish to fail in appreciation of what is commendable in it. Many a man, disturbed though he may be over present conditions, hesitates to speak out his convictions and to get into the turmoil of a discussion which seems certain to arouse more or less intense antagonisms and sometimes to lead to estrangements. One can only bespeak forbearance from those who differ, and a consideration of the subject with an eye single to the best and most efficient work of our institutions of learning. For after all, colleges and universities are essentially educational bodies whose reason for existence is that they prepare and equip earnest, well-trained and self-restrained young workers who will take their places in the business and professional life of the country to its efficient maintenance and further proper development. From this fundamental and all-important consideration we must not let our enthusiasm turn us aside. It certainly is true that the importance of athletics is greatly exaggerated, and, in the general view of the field occupied by our educational institutions, both on the part of those within and those without, there is much distortion of perspective. In company with many colleagues I have even heard with vast dismay, an eminent bishop in preaching a baccalaureate to the graduates of the year, spend half of his time discussing athletics as the paramount interest of the student body, when about fifteen per cent of his special audience were in the college class of men, another fifteen per cent or more were women, and the balance came from the several professional schools, whose graduates had with few ex-

*Read before the Second Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, New York City, December 28, 1907.

ceptions long gone by the period when they were available for teams. To the officers of instruction it seemed like magnifying a side issue, until the subjects of the first magnitude appropriate for the occasion were all lost to view.

This instance will serve to emphasize one point that I wish to make at the outset. Colleges and universities, properly so called, are not exactly the same thing in this connection. In the professional schools the constituency is older and more settled in its purposes in life. A very large proportion have passed their undergraduate days and have settled down to courses of study leading to definite careers. The spur of earning a livelihood is more keenly felt; the demands of instructors are more insistent and the administration aims to establish the same standards which are required in later life. The faculties are far more restive under the interference of student interests of all sorts with the proper fulfillment of demands of instruction. Membership on an athletic team is often equivalent, in the case of men of less than exceptional ability, either to practical suicide as regards a degree or to its postponement for a year. It is possible that with reference to purely college matters my own view may be influenced by the fact that I sit also in the faculty of a professional school, where requests for absences for athletic contests are looked upon in somewhat the same way as they would be at West Point. I can well imagine the feelings of the Commandant and his brother officers if schedules were submitted to them with the full expectation of favorable action, each involving from one to several days' absence upon journeys from fifty to a thousand miles in length, and three, four, or even half a dozen times in a single term. The discipline of a good engineering school is essentially military, and the ideals and professional ethics in engineering practice are very much the same as those of the older profession of arms.

Making all these allowances, however, there is no defensible reason why every good college should not be a place of just as insistent and regular work as a professional school, due allowance as regards the grade of work being made for the less mature development of the average student. The ideals of a definite profession as the goal are, of course, not present or at least not so pervasive and unifying, but sound standards of discipline cannot fail and the widespread easy-going atmosphere of our colleges is one of their greatest reproaches. They are suffering in the estimate of many discerning observers by comparison with the engineering and technical schools, so that the remark is at times made that colleges have grown to be essentially social organizations where so-called college life and college spirit are chiefly

cultivated, while the real educational work of the country is being done in the technical and scientific schools. In the latter for example, the gentleman's mark of C or 70, cuts a small figure. In view of instances of schedules of intercollegiate contests, which I may cite later, and which are the most extensively advertised things whereby observers at a distance may judge the spirit of an institution, it is small wonder that a very unfortunate impression is widely current regarding the real requirements of work in colleges in general.

The subject of the function of athletics divides itself naturally into two distinct parts, one local or intramural as we often call it; the other intercollegiate. I cannot take them up as entirely separate but will more especially advert to the first and then to the second.

Two years ago intercollegiate contests were confronted with a crisis. The extremely objectionable features of football had raised to an outbreak dissatisfaction long slumbering but none the less intense and sincere. There came a period of agitation and discussion; of some reform and repentance, and of probable improvement in the game of football itself. I speak with reserve because I do not know the revised game from personal observation. On the whole the net results for betterment according to the hopes of many in our faculties have proved small, and the strength of the grip which this particular sport has upon the institutions of learning has been demonstrated in the most emphatic way. Few faculties can stand against football. Except for the possible amelioration of some of its worst features of play, the following summary is substantially the total. Two institutions on the Pacific coast have changed from the old game to the Rugby type, and so far as I know the substitution is considered a decided improvement. One in the Central states abolished the old game, but has this month restored it under restrictions as to numbers of contests. Several others in the same section reduced the schedules somewhat. In the East, one university abolished the game and after two quiet autumns, incomparably superior to their predecessors as regards scholastic activities, is not likely to restore the old order of things. One great university uttered much brave speech and then discreetly stopped short of anything else, thus avoiding by masterly inactivity much uncomfortable agitation on the part of alumni and students, but as many onlookers hope, not permanently abandoning the position.

In the matter of football it is also noticeable that in several larger institutions out-of-town games are fewer than they formerly were. Thus Pennsylvania only played one this fall, the

Michigan game; Harvard visited Annapolis; and Yale went to West Point and Cambridge. — But of course as these teams did not go away from home and yet kept up a full schedule, other teams had of necessity to visit Philadelphia, Cambridge and New Haven, so that for colleges at large there is in this particular, little difference to be noted. I do not recall a case the past fall of a team going off for a week to some quiet resort in order to rest and steady the overwrought nerves of the players anticipatory to some important game—yet within a year or at most two years I think I am correct in saying this has been done by both Pennsylvania and Yale.

There is thus apparently some disposition manifested in two or three larger institutions to restrict excessive absences—and I may add that at Columbia our Committee has endeavored to keep baseball games, lacrosse and other similar contests confined to Saturday afternoons, a custom which some of us hope to see firmly established.

But nevertheless these results I consider small because the great reform that was before us of magnifying intramural games, each community by itself and of minimizing intercollegiate contests; of working toward wide and general participation in less intense sport, and curtailing the fierce struggles of a few who had occupied the stage to the exclusion of the rest; of multiplying the players and diminishing the rooters; of increasing the fun and recreation and decreasing the misguided heroism and the spirit of daring to die in the service of alma mater—these all-important considerations have largely dropped out of sight. Yet two years ago they were the great objects in the minds of many professors widely distributed over the country, and as I well know in the estimation of a large committee which took the questions up at Columbia for an elaborate report with recommendations.

I will therefore squarely propound the proposition that the proper function of athletics whether intramural or intercollegiate is that of recreation and refreshment from the inroads of sedentary life. Colleges and universities are places of pronounced sedentary life and of great drain upon nervous vitality. For most men the life is unnatural and tends to throw them into various disorders which are combated and eliminated by physical exercise preferably in the open air. The exercise is most beneficial when accompanied by the element of fun and amusement or when it takes the form of a contest in a friendly way between individuals or groups, well fairly matched. Such recreation must, of course, take place at times free from serious engagements, as in the hours of the afternoon either early or late, or

of a half holiday especially set aside for them. Or they may be more extensively practiced in vacation. As soon as the games or contests during the weeks set aside primarily for work, go beyond this field, they no longer discharge their proper functions but are over the bounds and are a menace to the very purposes for which colleges and universities are established.

I venture the statement that in as far as intercollegiate contests are concerned in almost all cases, the arduous training not only goes far beyond the field of recreation and refreshment but is itself an added and exhaustive nervous drain, cutting off the natural supply of energy and strength which ought to go into work. Instead of being a means of recreation and refreshment the teams have in their best uses become rallying points for intense patriotic devotion and support. To students and alumni alike they are concrete embodiments of alma mater, and they fill much the same place that the flag does to a regiment in battle. But in a less commendable aspect, they occupy also in the minds of many supporters and administrative officers the place of extremely important advertisements, which are exploited in the press as no other form of activity is, and they have a glamor for young lads about to enter college which is believed to help materially to swell the ranks of the Freshman class. For instance, within the past two years, two New England colleges which in the past have borne good reputations for earnest work and serious purpose have sent their baseball teams in the midst of the spring term each on a week's trip to and beyond Chicago. Yet after they crossed the Hudson river there is no institution with whom they had the slightest normal or natural rivalry and the taking of a squad of fifteen or twenty young men from their proper duties for a full week in addition to a schedule in other respects normally absorbing can only be defended on the ground of a hoped for advertisement. I question, however, if the procedure did not alienate more parents, that it ever attracted sons, and I believe that in and of themselves, this and similar practices are thoroughly indefensible and have done much harm. The schedule for next spring in the case of at least one of the two institutions referred to, is not essentially different, although Philadelphia is this year the objective instead of Chicago. Amid these conditions, officially approved, educational obligations of course sit lightly, and a community of young people with a not over-serious regard for responsibilities is the inevitable result.

Instances of this sort, which are not specially exceptional, lead me to advance the next point that, if we must have intercollegiate contests during term time, they should be limited to those with institutions not over an hour or two away on the railway. Where

there are lectures and recitations on Saturday mornings, the grounds of the competitor should be reached by a start after twelve o'clock noon. If Saturday is a holiday they should be reached by a morning start. With home and home games, there are few institutions which cannot in this way be provided with as many contests as are desirable. If old rivals at a greater distance are to meet, the game should be the objective point of the season and should be placed in the opening of a vacation or during one of the recesses with which our terms are punctuated. If championships are to be decided among several at remote situations, the only feasible plan is to meet as soon as vacation arrives at some central point, and decide baseball, lacrosse, soccer, and the like, by a tournament lasting several days, just as we have our boat races in June.

In no other way can proper scholastic requirements be maintained at the same time with intercollegiate contests, and the present practice of games with all sorts of remotely located competitors, with whom there is no natural rivalry and to meet whom long journeys must be undertaken, are only bringing our colleges into great disrepute as encouragers of idleness and trifling. A general agreement among college presidents as regards feasible zones, or at least among committees whose duty it is to pass on schedules, would do much to restore a reasonable balance of conflicting interests, and to ameliorate the hostility which so many earnest and sincere teachers feel toward a branch of student interests whose hold on alumni and undergraduates is exceedingly strong.

Intercollegiate contests are, however, to my mind, the least important feature of the function of athletics in our colleges and universities, for as I said before, refreshment and recreation are their main end. The recreative function can only be attained by a wide and general participation on the part of the student body, and by local contests between classes, schools, dormitories, fraternities, boarding clubs, or any other groups large enough to put two, five, nine or eleven representatives in the field. It is a hundred times more to the credit of Harvard to have scores of boat crews on the Charles, than to win the regatta on the Thames, and it is a hundred times more beneficial for all the rest of us to have our tennis courts, running tracks, baseball diamonds, gridirons, or hand ball courts, thickly peopled each afternoon, by as many teams as they can hold, than it is to go delirious over a contest on which for the time being all is staked. All who are fond of outdoor sports, and at the same time are anxious to do good service for alma mater, may well preach this doctrine in season and out. In its practice, too, I am firmly convinced it

will prove more satisfactory to our students and a source of greater enjoyment to them than the present order of things, criticism of which, or opposition to which, makes them so extremely restive and militant.

In summary therefore I will say regarding the function of athletics in our colleges and universities that it should be essentially one of refreshment from work. Athletics can only accomplish this end when pursued in moderation, by the student body generally, and at hours that do not conflict with scholastic requirements. I am personally convinced after long observation that on the whole we would be much better off in all the main purposes of a college or university if we did not have intercollegiate contests at all, but as I see no prospect of their disappearance, and as I respect the very sincere desire on the part of alumni and students to participate in them, I am willing to concede their indulgence on Saturday afternoons between near neighbors. Where undertaken between rivals, remote from each other, they can only be scheduled during the vacation, if we are to maintain our proper standards of work.

AMATEURISM.*

LUTHER H. GULICK, M. D.

The development of intercollegiate athletics, and of inter-institutional athletics in general, during the past few years has been correctly characterized as mushroom-like; but a growth of such character is not without cause, and such a cause is real. Imaginary causes cannot produce a situation such as we now have with reference to the interest of the public, as well as the student body, in inter-institutional and international sports. Hence it has been my hope to discover,—not so much the evils, which are numerous and serious, in connection with inter-institutional athletics,—as to try and find out why these athletics are growing and what is the nature of the forces producing them.

Inter-institutional sports do not exist for the benefit of the competitors. In this respect they differ radically from college or institutional athletics. When a single institution spends in one year a thousand dollars on each of one hundred men, who shall carry the reputation, the glory of the institution hopefully toward victory, and the one hundred men who are picked out for this supposedly physical training are those who by heredity and by environment are least in need of such intensive physical training, it becomes perfectly clear that the direct object is not the physical betterment of those inter-institutional athletes. When as physicians we examine these men who are competing for their institutions, we find ourselves divided as to whether the sum total on the physiological side has been beneficial or not beneficial.

When 40,000 persons come together to watch 22 men—plus a certain number of substitutes—play football; when there is an intense spirit of partisanship, often associated with the transfer of large sums of money; when the character of the play tolerated by the public opinion of the spectators is a dominant factor in the minds of the spectators as to what is ethically right and what is ethically wrong—then those 22 persons are creating and expressing ideals with reference to those things that are highest in life, ethical conduct and social relations. This game is particular—and intercollegiate sports in general—cannot stand or fall because of the number of knees sprained or the number of hearts dilated or even the number of lives lost—because lives are lost in a far larger way and with far more direful results through social

*Stenographic report of an address given before the Second Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, New York City, December 28, 1907.

and moral demoralization than through the physical injury of a comparatively few persons. The question must turn upon the effects of this playing upon the moral character of the general student body.

As one of your speakers has indicated, athletics represent the chief interest and form the ethical and social relations of the men who in the future are going to dominate this country. Granted that approximately two per cent of the young men of America go to college (I believe there are slightly more than this) and that these two per cent are going to hold 50 per cent of the positions involving the greatest leadership in the public opinion of America—then this athletic problem becomes most significant.

Let us turn to the case of the loyal alumnus, with whose loyalty I sympathize. He has means. He lives in some other city than where his alma mater is located. He retains that interest in athletic sports which he developed in college. He is the patron of the high schools in his vicinity in their athletic sports. He functionates as an athletic official, as contributor of prizes and trophies. He is on the athletic boards for the management, the conduct of athletics. He has a genuine, personal interest in the boys. He is interested in those who do well in their studies and he is immensely interested in those who excell in manly sports. Here is a young man who is finishing his high school work. He has done well in scholarship, very well in athletics. The alumnus believes in the boy and he loves his college. He wants the boy to go to college. The boy cannot go to college in his present financial situation and so the alumnus says, not only quite innocently, but laudably, in so far as he thinks, "Go to my college and I will see you through." He believes he is doing a good thing for the boy as well as for the college. So the boy goes to college. I have stated the case as favorably as I think I can state it, in order to show its untenable position a little later. I have given not a hypothetical, but an actual case.

I will give another, that of a member of the faculty of an institution, a man of independent means, who loves his institution and who has been connected with its athletic organizations for a generation. He likes the boys individually; he gets acquainted with them. He gets directly in touch with them, and through graduates, with desirable boys coming out of secondary schools. Occasionally he says to a boy, indirectly, of course, "Come to this college and I will see your way through." He believes in the boy thoroughly and unless he has a good character, as well as excellence in athletics, he would not do it. He puts him through college. And so he maintains in that university several of those

boys that are of great credit to the university from an athletic standpoint.

I will state another case, still further over the line, that of the athletic trainer, who is not a member of the faculty, who has had put into his possession, not his own private funds, but for his own private distribution, a considerable sum of money to use in precisely the same way as in the previous case, except that it is understood definitely that these funds are to be expended for athletic purposes.

The effect of all this can be seen from one side by noting its relation to the secondary schools. Boys in our secondary schools are usually approached when they make exceptionally good performances, either in major or in minor sports, with so-called "offers" from some one interested or connected with some college or educational institution. The father of one boy in Brooklyn boasted that his boy got letters from 43 different educational institutions. He was incomparably the best boy in this part of the world in his special line, and it was a very desirable line from the standpoint of athletic representation. Such a condition makes a commercial atmosphere, and boys speak very freely about it. They have spoken to me on the subject and they say: "I have such and such offers. I am going to wait and see what I can get. I want to go to college, and this is the best way of doing it. This is the thing on which I stand the best show and I see no reason why I shouldn't do it." And I do not know that the boys can be blamed. It is a perfectly simple, open and shut, pay proposition. That is the situation which the secondary schools must face because of the present situation in the colleges. It is better now than it used to be; things have to be done far more indirectly than formerly.

Question: Who makes those offers?

They come almost exclusively from individuals, not from organizations and not from the officers of the institutions. There are such offers from institutions, but they are not reputable institutions, not such as would be associated with this body.

Question: Do you consider the officers of institutions as parties?

Not directly. It was the effect upon the secondary school boy, or his standpoint of looking at it, that I was considering. It is on the moral side that interests me most.

The result on college athletics of securing for the colleges these men from the secondary schools who are particularly expert is this: if it is worth while to play baseball or football extraordinarily well, young men will be attracted to baseball and to football as a means of social advancement, financial advancement, and

business advancement. In one of our insular possessions a young man, a native of the land, with hardly any preliminary training ran 100 yards in ten and two-fifths seconds. He is now studying in this country on a government scholarship, and so far as we know, that is the only thing that made anybody think of him as a desirable scholarship man. The presence in our athletic competitions of a group of men who are peculiarly expert, so shuts out the chances of the average man that he will no longer compete. The competition is no longer fair or even. This is the history of athletic sports from the days of Greece down. The professional in competition with the amateur throws out the amateur. That has been already accomplished in American colleges and secondary schools, and is being done even in the grammar schools of America. A boy came to me two years ago. He was going to one of our high schools, and he said, "I want to play on the football team. I would like to go to college; it would be a good thing, and if I can play two or three first-class games, it is all that I need." He needed certain help, and he came to me thinking that I could help him and would. His case is not an exceptional one; his honesty is exceptional.

The playing for compensation, directly or indirectly, particularly in summer baseball, creates a group of men with whom it is unfair to amateurs to play, because the competition is not even. It is an unfair competition when the man who plays for fun and recreation plays with men who get compensation. It is not a question of morality; it is a question of fairness, and whether we want to keep athletic sports at all as a medium of fun and recreation. I have dwelt on the primary difference between the amateur and the professional, because that is a primary question. The professional can only remain a professional on the basis of his doing super-excellent work. When he gets into a condition where he no longer wins, his livelihood, his remaining in college (if he depends upon that source) is gone.

I am not an advocate of the easy loser. I think the primary difference between sport in America and in England is a distinction of this kind. The English criticise us for the intensity with which we take our athletic sports; they say we train too hard for them and that our men will punish themselves to finish first. They say we go into athletics with the desperate earnestness with which one goes into a battle. I think that is right. The ability to do a thing tremendously, to take hold, to expend all of one's power, to go to the limit, that is the quality that is making America what it is. Of all the aggravating persons to play tennis or anything else with is the man who plays pretty well, but who does not care very much whether he wins or loses. The

true spirit of sportsmanship involves the doing of one's absolute best. I am not contrasting the easy loser with the graceful loser, nor the honest loser; but I am advocating the doing of one's best absolutely, training if it is worth while going into it, carrying the so-called "honor" of America at the Olympic Games, and then if it is worth while to regard himself as a representative, to put himself in the most perfect condition to represent this country.

A new conscience is developing in the civilized world. The first time this was particularly brought to my mind was in connection with the Dreyfus trial. So far as I know, that was one of the first cases of injustice to an individual where the whole civilized world responded. History is full of greater or equal cases of injustice, but history is not full of any cases where interest was taken by the world in the fate of such a man. A new era in honesty has dawned and loyalty has been extended in a new way. To mention only a few examples of this: the recent great reconstruction of public opinion with reference to the operation of trusts, due to the undoubted dishonesty of certain trusts; the complete disapprobation which has been thrown upon certain men who represented these trusts, men who in their private lives are absolutely impeccable. Twenty years ago the public would never have condemned them, and some of them are the most surprised men at being condemned. A new social conscience is awakening. The recent discoveries in connection with our banks and particularly the reaction of public opinion to them, indicate this new feeling of corporate honesty as distinguished from individual honesty. The corporate conscience is being developed; it is the chief characteristic of the century on which we have started. This is predominantly a social century. The difficulties are not difficulties to be solved by science, but they are primarily difficulties with reference to human relations. Because of the large aggregation of individuals there is need of that form of education which shall guide men in their corporate relation to society. The community in our country is not situated as the Jeffersonian Democrats seem to imagine (excuse me, gentlemen, I do not mean to introduce politics) of a group of independent individuals. We do not exist as independent individuals. We exist in groups; those who stand as individuals are relatively few. The successful party politician gets the men who can handle his group, his crowd. This is the same spirit as that which makes the boys' gang—both the chief evils and the chief good of them.

My belief with reference to intercollegiate athletics is, then, that they do not exist for the individual playing; they are not done for the benefit of the competitor. They are for focusing

the consciousness of an institution, and in that they meet the coming social demand.

The basis of ethics is loyalty. I have seen a number of schools in this city in which there was no feeling of school consciousness as a whole. There was no assembly place to accommodate all the students, no outside function which brought them together. There was no occasion through which they could become conscious of each other and conscious as a group. I have seen such schools, under the influence of a team going out and representing them in athletics, awaken to consciousness, awaken to loyalty to their school. That, I take it, is the great object of inter-institutional sports, the unconscious object—the necessity for something that shall weld into one the attention of the student and the faculty body, something so fundamental and unitary as to permit inclusion in its sweep of practically all the members of an educational institution.

Athletics are important, it seems to me, not as athletics, but because of this social effect and because social opportunities similar in character are so few. The times demand men with higher corporate morality. That cannot be gotten from lectures, nor from books. That cannot be gotten even through the example of persons who are merely fine in their personal lives. It can only be gotten by doing the thing itself, by being loyal to the whole. The point of view that I wish to present here is that there is no other avenue open by means of which it is possible to develop the idea of corporate, or inter-institutional morality, that which represents the individuals but includes them as a whole, as inter-institutional athletics. A generation ago there was a debating association in Ohio that included a large number of colleges and did this same thing. There the general interest was in the inter-institutional debate, and it brought out the feeling for the whole. Class spirit in America is declining because of the growth of numbers and because of the elective system of courses. This was one of the opportunities for the development of the social spirit, but it has gone.

We say, "represent the honor of the institution," and I think that is coming. Within my own memory, at an intercollegiate meeting in the United States—it was a small one—the two colleges were tied and the last event was a mile run; red pepper was thrown into the leading runner's face and the event was won by the rival college; and the man who did it was tolerated in the institution from which he came! No man could remain for a day in an institution who should do this thing now. The standards of morality are advancing fast, and I take it that the time is not far distant when public opinion will not permit cor-

porate action which is now not tolerated in individuals.—Students may be trusted in the rooms of their friends. They will not steal the possessions of their friends, but the time has not yet come when games will not be stolen if the thing can be done. This is a reach toward corporate honesty to which we are tending.

When Arthur Duffy confessed that for years he had been humbugging athletic officials, that he had really been taking money for his athletic prowess when he had pretended and sworn that he had not, he mistook the public judgment that would be passed upon him. He apparently thought that the public would regard it as a great joke, and that he would be regarded the lion of the athletic hour. He was mistaken. Public sentiment has branded him as a man who for purposes of financial gain has lied continuously and systematically and who, through his great skill, has been able to defraud athletic organizations by misrepresenting his amateur status, thus keeping other athletes, who were amateurs, from successful competition.

Here is a powerful social force. It may work toward a higher social morality or toward a lower one. If the various athletic bodies—this Association and the Amateur Athletic Union—co-operate in maintaining inter-institutional athletics on a really amateur basis and develop the strong as well as fine phases of corporate character, we have before us such an instrument for the development of the kind of character as the world now needs and is looking toward.

THE LENGTH OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC SCHEDULES.*

PAUL C. PHILLIPS, M. D., AMHERST COLLEGE.

NOTE. This paper expresses the personal views of the writer, and is not to be taken as representing officially those of his college.

Twenty years ago it would have been considered foolish for a body of college professors to consume a half hour in the consideration of such a subject as the above. To-day the appropriateness of the topic is at once apparent, for in two decades intercollegiate athletics have assumed such prominence in college life as to demand the serious attention of educators.

We may sigh for the conditions of that remote period when matters athletic seldom invaded the sanctity of the faculty meeting; we may believe that such conditions should prevail again and the time of our faculties be once more restored to them for strictly educational purposes and may even plan to bring such an elysium about, but that will not relieve us from the responsibility of dealing with the athletic problems which confront us here and now.

We are in the midst of an athletic age. Its athleticism is of vast importance in safeguarding the race from the physical, mental and moral dangers incident to our civilization.

College athletics are but a part of this significant return to the physical life; they are the play of the "children of a larger growth." Young America is returning to his own, physically. If he returns too far, if the spirit of emulation leads him to excess, he must be controlled: he must be taught proportion in his college life. But to ignore the great benefits of athletics, to fail to obtain them, or to so restrict sports that they do not arise spontaneously is to do our students a grievous wrong. Whether the control of this great, beneficent force is directly from the faculty, through the athletic councils of our colleges, or in whatever way, the faculties are in the last analysis the ones responsible. But the need of control, and that by the faculties, needs no argument in this presence, it is the *raison d'être* of this association. How to do it is the question.

Among these mooted questions of athletic control one of the most important is that of the length of athletic schedules.

The topic as assigned evidently assumes intercollegiate con-

*Read before the Second Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, New York City, December 28, 1907.

tests. While their desirability is questioned in some quarters and their value is debatable,—the writer wishes at the outset to state his belief in their value, rightly conducted.

The question of the length of athletic schedules is important because it concerns the scholarship of the students on the teams, their physical condition and their ideals of college life, and frequently, especially on long trips, their morals. It concerns also indirectly the scholarship, the physical life and the ideals of the rest of the student body, for if the schedule is of such a length as to injure or benefit the team, it must, from its very example, affect the student body to a degree in like manner. In the same way the ideals of students will be affected by the proportion the faculty allows in the college life of men on the teams.

Financial considerations also enter into the question. The length of schedules may be considered from the view of the faculty; as regards the effect on scholarship; on the ideals of the students on and off the teams; on their physique and on their morals, and still further as to possible advertising of the institution.

We may look at them from the standpoint of the trainer and coach, considering the number of games necessary to properly condition physically the men on the team, to teach them the game, to try out the material, to give them the experience of actual competition in order to win the big games later on. Still further we may look at it through the eye of the manager, for whom a successful season is one financially good.

And lastly the attitude of undergraduates and interested alumni may be considered where victory stands foremost, but after that as large a number of games as possible, consistent with moderate cost.

The length of a schedule should attempt to harmonize all these factors. To ignore them or fail to give each due weight in the determination is to be narrow and dictatorial. This does not imply on the part of the faculty any relinquishment of ideals; each factor must be given its proper emphasis, and sometimes existing evils must be remedied at once, but a certain amount of tact will often easily bring those who think otherwise to your way of thinking, and sometimes also an ideal may be attained gradually with better results than suddenly by a regulation or fiat. It is better if possible to take all parties with us when we progress. We cannot legislate the evils of athletics out of existence all at once. Our work should be constructive.

This means that there should be frankness and harmony between the faculties and athletic councils, a certain coöperation in the management of athletics.

It is wise to have a definite limit set to the number of games allowed in each sport. Legislation here is of great value to all concerned in the avoidance of difficulties. Considering each schedule on its merits leads a committee to stray from the ideals it has set before it, not because of a change of judgment but from pressure of circumstances. It is better both for students and faculty to discuss schedules within certain well defined and well understood limitations than without such safeguards.

The conditions in our colleges and universities vary so much that it would seem unwise to state at the beginning any definite number of games which should be allowed in each branch of sport. It will be more helpful to state certain principles which seem to us fundamental in the determination of their length.

The most important of these is that *athletes should not be treated as a special class*. This hardly needs explanation. It means that they should be given no special privileges; that there should be no special legislation for them. The college is or should be a democracy and all undergraduates in their rights and privileges should be equal.

An aristocracy in letters, in social life, or in athletics will naturally arise among the students, but for the faculty to foster by regulations any one of these would be subversive of Americanism. To do so in favor of athletics would be to subsidize an *athletocracy*. This means that students on teams should not be allowed more absences from college than their fellows. An exception is often asked for by them as a privilege, even a right for the work they are doing for the college in the way of advertising and the like, or because of the stress of the sport and the length of their schedule. The moment we enter upon class legislation, however, we encounter storms, and there seems to be no valid reason for such a course.

This principle is to-day agreed to by most of those present I think, but it has not always been so. The favoritism shown the athletic class in some instances has been the *bete noire* of the whole athletic structure. The faculty has stood to its undergraduates on teams in loco (grand) parentis in granting of privileges and in leniency toward their failings.

On the other hand the athletes should be treated with scrupulous fairness and be given all the rights and privileges of their fellow students. This rule too has sometimes been violated.

Somewhat as a corollary to this proposition is the second principle, namely, that *schedules should not be approved which require on the part of the team a greater number of absences than is allowed to all students*.

To approve so long a schedule carries with it the faculty ap-

proval of excess of absences, thus virtually legalizing such excesses, and ipso facto granting them special privileges.

Most colleges and universities allow a certain number of absences from class for which no excuses need be given, the most common proportion being one tenth of all the exercises in a term or semester. It is the approving of a schedule requiring absences to exceed this proportion which we decry. With some colleges the method is to excuse for a good reason a limited number of absences. In such cases it would be the granting at the outset of an extra number of absences to the athletic class. Under either method the student on an intercollegiate team having used up the allowed or customary number on trips, in the nature of things is likely to require several more for exigencies, which will make him exceed the allowed number. Most colleges require some kind of a makeup for such excesses and here the athlete would be required to take the makeup like the rest. But the frequency of such necessities among athletes should make us loth to approve schedules which will even use up all of the allowed number of cuts.

Assuming that the colleges represented here grant their students about one tenth of all exercises for allowed absences, we have, if we agree to the two previous propositions, at once a natural limit set to schedules. If the college schedule is arranged by terms, the one tenth grants four or five absences in each subject and, taking the average number of exercises required by trips, would allow from eight to ten visiting games. As schedules run, the number of visiting and home games is about even, so that a schedule of from sixteen to twenty games in term time, might not require over-cutting by the members of the team.

This is the first and outer limit. It is one seldom exceeded by by any but baseball and basket ball teams.

If the college schedule is made up in semesters the same reasoning might apply, for the active seasons of most intercollegiate sports lie within one term, and while the allowed number of cuts for the whole semester might be greater, students should not be allowed to so closely use up their allowed absences.

Where sports run into two terms as basket ball, track athletics, ice hockey and the like, other methods of limitations must be used.

Some colleges control schedules by allowing so many days or half days absence from college. This plan really rests upon the principle I have mentioned of not allowing the absences to exceed the allowed number.

The physical effect of the exercise is another natural determining factor in limitations of schedules. This applies with greater force to football, but in a lesser degree to basket ball,

hockey, lacrosse and all very strenuous games. In these a game a week is considered even by trainers, about all a team of college men can stand physically. In addition to the almost daily work of practice, it is to be remembered that they are subject to injuries, and are doing mental work the rest of the time, and so cannot be expected to do the work of men, who, like professionals, have nothing else to do.

One game a week would limit football to nine games from the last Saturday in September to the third or fourth Saturday in November, inclusive, and we may consider that number an *extreme* for this game so far as the physical conditions are concerned.

We have given two of the more important factors which should receive great weight in the determination of schedules. In the light of these let us consider individually the schedules of various sports.

Football—Already we have given the extreme limit of a football schedule of games: this number is to-day seldom exceeded by our colleges. Is it wise to still further reduce it? The effect upon scholarship would be fully as beneficial if the length of the season covered by the schedule was reduced, as, no matter how few the games, while the playing season lasts, the members of the team are under sufficient physical strain to seriously interfere with the college work. The wisdom of those colleges which have abolished the preliminary season of the practice is hereby apparent, and it would be well to still further reduce the season for purely scholarship reasons. October first to November eighteenth, the natural season in our latitude of such sport, would give seven weeks, which surely allows sufficient time for such a strenuous game. Adopting one game a week as the nominal frequency, this would reduce the games to seven, after a week of preliminary practice. The intercollegiate conference of the west allows but five games.

Trainers with whom I have spoken say that five or six weeks is time enough to get men into condition for the big games. The greatest difficulty is to keep them in condition once attained.

To the coach the time and number of games look inadequate to teach the men the game, try out the material, and develop the team play. If however we yield more to football education, are we not sacrificing somewhat the academic training for which the men supposedly came to college, especially in view of the amount of time each day and the energy which the sport demands? Football makes the greatest inroads of all the major sports into scholarship as statistics show, and while it does undoubtedly develop the manly qualities which we all desire in students and develops

college loyalty, it should not be allowed to assume too great proportions.

Among the smaller colleges the scarcity of material from a purely competitive standpoint would especially restrict the number of games.

The financial reason is fairly strong against reduction, especially in the west where colleges are widely separated and trips costly. In general however it is the large games at the end of the season on which the financial success of the season depends, the earlier ones only about paying expenses. For the *student body* this would reduce the number of games to be watched, but also lessen the expense. Their interest would probably be heightened for the big games, and there would be one or two preliminary home games; in the case of large universities even more, by which to get a line on their team.

Nine games of intercollegiate football per season is the extreme; a reduction to seven for the above reasons would be far better and would meet with little opposition on the part of coach, trainer, student or manager. Five seems to me better still, as an ideal to look forward to and work for, with a six weeks' season and a game a week after the first fortnight, except at the close of the season when a two weeks' interval would be given.

The natural limit we set to schedules in any sport in term time was twenty. Most colleges allow more games than this in baseball, some as high as thirty in ten weeks. How our students can play three games of intercollegiate baseball per week, even if half of them are at home, and do justice to the college work, is inexplicable. The favorable results from the game surely cannot counterbalance the injury to scholarship. Twenty in all, or two games a week, would seem an extreme for each schedule from the standpoint of scholarship. Even twenty games, a schedule of average length, requires two games a week and one of these visiting, or one day out of six on the cars. This amount affects scholarship injuriously. Recent statistics seem to indicate that baseball men generally drop off from three to five per cent in their scholarship in the playing season. These two games a week also give the sport as an exhibition too great prominence in the eyes of the team and men. It is not that these men are not desired to get that amount of exercise daily, but that each week the college is to be amused and these nine men are to do it.

Physically, too, twenty games for college men with something else to do is somewhat of a strain. The travel cannot but tell on them physically, and even the home games while entailing less physical loss put the student under considerable nervous strain.

A reduction to as few as ten games, for scholarship reasons,

seems to me an ideal toward which we should work. A game a week, one every other week visiting, would seem in an educational institution, a fair number.

From the trainer's standpoint there would be no objections, as baseball requires little but good hours, habits and food, but to the coach this would probably seem too few games. The men are kept up to the game better by more games. Financial objections arise also. To sell season tickets there must be more games to see. The argument is somewhat specious however. Here, as in football, the few big games largely take care of the finances, and with a lesser numbers the receipts would, as they did in football, become greater.

In smaller colleges the preliminary games seldom much more than pay for themselves.

A shorter season would reduce the cost to each student of his season ticket.

But supposing that baseball cannot be a success financially with so short a schedule. That might prove a blessing in disguise in the abolition of transient and high priced professional coaches, of training tables and costly equipment.

For the present however we would recommend a schedule in baseball not to exceed eighteen games. This would not markedly injure coaching or finances, would give plenty of games for inter-collegiate fraternizing and not seriously interfere with college work.

Basket ball holds a unique place among the most strenuous sports, in that it is generally played indoors and so under not the best hygienic conditions. Many of the games and much of the practice come at night, interfering with the normal study hours. Moreover it invades, as few sports do, the winter term which most of us, I am sure, desire to be kept nearly inviolate for study. This complex of reasons, and not any one alone, would lead to a limitation of schedules in this sport. Schedules containing as many as twenty-nine games and a season of nearly three months have been approved by our colleges, although the tendency of the past few years has been toward reduction. Ten games, one a week from early in January to late in March, would be a more suitable number, when the scholarship interests are considered. A reduction in this number by using the first two or three weeks of each season for preliminary work only, would be desirable. This might reduce the games to eight. Considerations of training, coaching and finances would obtain no more here than in a reduction of the baseball season, in fact less because the budget is much smaller and the coach and trainer not as frequent or insistent as in other sports.

Track and field sports generally give us little trouble from the length of their schedules. One or two meets in the winter term and three or four in the spring are as many meets as most colleges allow and they are probably sufficient.

The schedules of gymnastic teams, too, so far as I can learn, present little difficulty from their length. Financial considerations operate generally to make the schedule a short one without legislation on the part of faculty or committee.

Ice hockey, with basket ball, is a strenuous sport and is played largely in the winter term. It differs in that the conditions are more hygienic for the players. In the number of games allowed and the schedule, it may be classed with basket ball, ten being permitted.

Rowing presents few difficulties from the number of competitors desired. The strenuousness of the sport and the length of the season, are main causes for solicitude, consequently the sport will not be considered here.

We have spoken as definitely as it seems wise of the number of games which should be allowed on the schedules of various teams.

In conclusion let me call to your attention a plan suggested by Mr. Derby in a recent number of the "Outlook." Mr. Derby won his H on the football field a few years ago. The plan is what I will characterize as a "delayed varsity season." It consists of allowing only about four weeks in the varsity season in each sport, previous to which there shall be as many teams as possible; inter-class, inter-fraternity and what not, in which the athletic material shall get physically conditioned, learn the game and show their ability to make the varsity squad. Intercollegiate sports having finished their work a few end-of-the-season intercollegiate games would fitly conclude the athletic season.

While objections will at once occur to this plan it seems to me it contains much of value. While seemingly radical it is really moderate in its tone; it does not abolish intercollegiate relations. It would make for a wider dissemination of athletics throughout the colleges, an end devoutly to be wished, and at the same time would stimulate college loyalty and unity of spirit in the intra-collegiate season by the prospect of intercollegiate contests later on. Such additions, unsupervised, Mr. Derby informs us really did exist at Harvard some years ago and influenced very favorably the wider dissemination of sport at Harvard, although not the number of victories over Yale.

A plan something like this could, by concert of action it seems to me, be arranged, which would be most helpful in regulating reasonably our athletic schedules.